

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

By this Amendment, claims 9-20 have been added. Accordingly, claims 5-20 are pending in the present application.

The objection to the disclosure is noted. With respect to the Examiner's changes required to the paragraphs at page 1, line 2; page 13, line 6; and page 19, line 1, all of these changes have been made.

With respect to the "Summary of the Invention" section of the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that the current "Summary of the Invention" section accurately reflects the currently claimed invention.

With respect to the Examiner's comment regarding the last line of page 23, Applicants respectfully request clarification regarding the Examiner's contention that "uninitiated alterations improperly appear in the paragraph text." Applicants do not understand which alterations are considered improper by the Examiner and respectfully submit that this paragraph is proper.

With respect to the description relating to Figs. 3, 5 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the labeled features/elements are fully described in the specification, if not in relation to the specific figures themselves, then in the description relating to other figures. The Examiner's attention is directed to the Preliminary Amendment filed along with this application wherein the paragraph beginning at page 5, lines 17-20, was amended to include the sentence "In the drawings, like references denote like elements and parts and accordingly each reference may not be described in connection with each specific drawing in which it appears." Accordingly, since all features/elements of the drawings are fully described in the specification, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn. not

Not
The objection to the drawings is noted. In response, Applicants submit herewith new formal drawings for substitution in the present application which incorporate the changes suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the EP (604) reference in view of Ishikawa, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claims 5 and 8 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a planar dielectric integrated circuit which includes "line-conversion conductor patterns which are connected to said first planar dielectric line and which are used to perform mode conversion between said first planar dielectric line and said slot line." As admitted on page 3 of the Office Action, the EP reference neither discloses nor suggests these line conversion conductor patterns which are used to perform mode conversion.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art, given the EP reference, would have absolutely no motivation to combine the teachings therein with those of Ishikawa, et al. because the propagation mode used in dielectric line LN303 of the EP reference is already compatible with the mode used in the circuit part module 305. Specifically, as described on page 10, lines 28-38 of the EP reference, the dielectric line LN303 does not undergo a change in the propagation mode employed in the line to another mode. See page 10, line 50 through page 11, line 6, wherein it is stated that the mode propagating through the dielectric line LN303 and resonators 66 and 69 is already in a TE010 mode, which is compatible with the electronic device 305. Thus, it is clear from the teachings of the EP reference that the structure described therein is nothing more than that described as prior art on pages 1-2 of the present application.

Since the propagation mode employed in the dielectric line LN303 is already in a mode which is compatible with the electronic device 305, if one were to substitute the mode conversion structures 7a and 7b of Ishikawa, et al. into the device of the EP

reference, the device of the EP reference would fail to function properly. Thus, one of skill in the art would have no motivation whatsoever to combine the teachings of these two references, and in fact would not combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 5 and 8 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 6 and 7 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 5 and include all the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims include additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 6 and 7 are likewise patentable.

Claims 9-20 have been added to more fully cover the scope of the present invention. Consideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to the non-statutory double patenting rejection, enclosed is a terminal disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent 6,445,255. Accordingly, withdrawal of the non-statutory double patenting rejection is respectfully requested. N

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of new claims 9-20 and allowance of the application with claims 5-20 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: March 11, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By

Richard LaCava

Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas, 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorneys for Applicant